

### REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 32, and 43 are independent. Claims 1 and 10 are amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least at page 10, lines 10-16 and page 12, line 17 to page 13, line 17 of the specification. Claim 44 is added. Reconsideration of the action mailed August 22, 2006, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 11, 13, 16-18, 20, 22-24, 27, and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,044,471 ("Colvin"). The Examiner rejected claims 25-26, 28, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Colvin. The Examiner rejected claims 10, 12, 14-15, 21, and 32-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Colvin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,260 ("Wilde"). The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Colvin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,068 ("Brandt"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

#### **Section 102 Rejections**

Claim 1 stands rejected over Colvin. Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method that includes distributing authorization keys from a subscription server to computers. Each authorization key identifies a fingerprint of a particular computer for which the authorization key is valid.

Colvin does not disclose or suggest an authorization key that identifies a fingerprint of a particular authorized computer for which the authorization key is valid. In rejecting dependent claim 10, which includes similar limitations, the Examiner acknowledges that Colvin does not disclose the recited feature. However, the Examiner states that Wilde discloses an authentication key that identifies an authorized computer. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Wilde discloses techniques for automatically installing an operating system on a networked computer. *See* col. 1, lines 12-13. An administrator generates a personalization parameters file including personalization parameters for the individual end users. *See* col. 6,

lines 30-32. When installing the operating system on the client workstations, the administrator uses the personalization parameters file to edit the operating system configuration file to include the personalization parameters for the particular end users of the client workstation. *See* col. 6, lines 34-43. The operating system uses the configuration file in installing the operating system on the client workstation. *See* col. 6, lines 44-45.

In particular, the Examiner cites col. 11, lines 11-31 as disclosing information about the identity of an authorized computer. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 11, lines 11-31 reads as follows:

Individual desktop profiles are set off by a bracketed section headers. In the portion shown, the section headers "[Computer 1]" and "[Computer 2]" each indicate separate desktop profiles 39. The section header is preferably followed by a plurality of keys, each key indicating a personalization parameter. Each key has an argument which indicates the value of the key. In the example shown, the section headers "[Computer 1]" and "[Computer 2]" each have a "Name" key with the value "Joe's computer." This indicates that the name of the user for both computer 1 and computer 2 is "Joe". Thus, the user "Joe" has at least two desktop profiles, one could be, for example, a desktop computer and the second could be for a laptop computer. The key "IsInDomain" indicates the domain in which the configured workstation will reside. The key "IP Address" gives the IP address for the workstation and the keys "LoginID" and "InitialPassword" give the login ID and initial password for the end-user. It is to be understood that numerous other keys can also be used in the desktop profile file, for example, keys to indicate a computer name, product ID, and an organization name, to name a few.

The cited portion of Wilde discloses desktop profile files and the particular information included in the profile. The profile identifies individual users of particular workstations. The profile files are generated and stored on the server computer. *See* col. 10, lines 12-62; col. 11, lines 32-35; FIG. 1. The profile files are used to modify a general answer file (configuration file) to a personalized answer file for the operating system. *See* col. 10, lines 59-62. The personalized operating system is then installed on the workstation. *See* col. 14, line 59 to col. 15, line 12.

While the personalization information incorporated into the configuration file is provided to the workstation during installation of the operating system, this does not identify a computer for which an authorization key is valid. The information identifies a particular user in order to

provide a personalized environment for that user for each computer used by the user, not to allow (or prevent) use of the operating system. The profile file cited by the Examiner does not disclose or suggest an authorization key that identifies a fingerprint of a particular computer for which the authorization key is valid.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-31, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 4 stands rejected over Colvin. Claim 4 is directed to a method where an authorization key carries information about a validity period. The Examiner states that Colvin discloses this feature at col. 4, lines 2-4. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The cited portion of Colvin reads, in context, as follows:

Passwords 16 within series 18 may be randomly assigned or may be generated using a suitable algorithm, many of which are known in the art. Likewise, passwords 16 may be based on serial numbers 14, a current data or version data 17, and/or a previous password 20 from the series of passwords.

The cited portion of Colvin discloses how a password can be generated by a server. Once generated, the password is sent to an end user in order to activate an application. *See* col. 5, lines 14-35. However, while the cited portion discloses techniques for generating a password, there is no mention of any information included within the password. Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the password includes information about a validity period for the password. In contrast, claim 4 requires that the authentication key include information about a validity period for the authentication key. Furthermore, while Colvin does disclose that the application can be valid for a particular period, after which a new password is required, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the validity period is included in the password. *See* col. 5, lines 36-49. Instead, the counter or calendar disclosed by Colvin resides locally on the computer of the end user. *See* col. 5, lines 36-49.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

Claim 12 stands rejected over Colvin in view of Wilde. Claim 12 is directed to a method where the identity of a computer carried by an authorization key includes information stored on a microprocessor, a hard disk, or a network interface card. The Examiner acknowledges that Colvin does not disclose the recited feature, but that Wilde does at col. 11, lines 11-31.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, the cited portion of Wilde discloses a profile file used to personalize an operating system for particular user. The cited portion does not disclose or suggest using an authentication key to identify a particular computer for which the authorization key is authorized. Furthermore, the cited portion does not disclose or suggest that the identifier of the computer includes information stored on a microprocessor, a hard disk, or a network interface card. The cited portion discloses network information such as a domain or IP address identifying each computer used by particular users. However, this does not disclose or suggest hardware information stored on a microprocessor, a hard disk, or a network interface card.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 stands rejected over Colvin in view of Wilde. Claim 32 is directed to a method that includes providing information about the user in exchange for an authorization key that is associated with a unique identifier of the computer on which the application program is to run and which enables the application to be run in the chosen mode. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 32, as well as claims 33-42, which depend from claim 32, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 43 stands rejected over Colvin in view of Wilde. Claim 43 is directed to a method that includes providing an authorization key to the computer, the authorization key being associated uniquely with the computer from which the user is attempting to use the copy of the application program. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 43 is in condition for allowance.

### **New Claims**

Claim 44 is added. Claim 44 is directed to a method that includes an application program that compares the information of an authorization key identifying a particular computer with an identity of the computer and where the application program is not operable if the information does not match. Applicant respectfully requests that claim 44 be allowed.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply the required excess claim fee of \$50 and the required Petition for Extension of Time Fee of \$450 and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 22, 2007

/Brian J. Gustafson/  
Brian J. Gustafson  
Reg. No. 52,978

**Customer No.: 26161**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696